



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the fisheries. When a similar misunderstanding arose some twelve years ago about our north-eastern boundary, a very serious alarm spread among men whose business was connected with the ocean, and prevailed to such an extent, that some individuals lost scores of thousands of dollars from the mere apprehension of war; but so altered is now the general tone, and so decided is public opinion understood to be in both countries against a resort to the sword for the settlement of the points in controversy, that business has swerved, in consequence of these difficulties, scarcely a hair's breadth from its wonted course. Politicians, perhaps for base, party purposes, have talked loud about the matter; but not the slightest panic has reached the insurance office or the counting-room. Fifty or even thirty years ago, war might have been apprehended as very likely to result from such a misunderstanding; and the fact that such an event now excites scarce a ripple on the surface of the world's commerce and intercourse, shows somewhat strikingly how different such questions have come to be treated from what they once were, and how great and auspicious a change has already been effected on the subject of international Peace.

We might quote half a dozen similar cases within the last ten years; but this single one may suffice to put the reader upon a train of reflection which will convince him that the cause of Peace, though necessarily slow in its progress, and imperceptible at the time in the decisive changes it is effecting in the international habits of Christendom, is still moving onward with a sure and steady step to a glorious triumph in due time. We need patience; but if we hold on and hold out, to the end in using aright the means of God's appointment for the result we seek, it will, in his own good time, come with absolute certainty. Nor does He even now withhold providential indications amply sufficient to encourage our utmost efforts; for the events of the last twenty, or even ten years, prove this cause to have made far greater progress than its most sanguine friends could have expected so soon from the small amount of efforts hitherto made.

EX-SENATOR BENTON ON PEACE.

This veteran statesman, long a favorite and champion of the democratic party, we are glad to find, in a speech recently addressed to his constituents on the occasion of his re-election to Congress, giving utterance, in the extracts which follow, to views far in advance of what we have been wont to hear from politicians:

I shall be in favor of peace, friendship and commerce with all nations, and war with none, except for great national causes; and that after exhausting all resources of honorable adjustment. The last argument of kings—the *ultima ratio regum*, so proudly inscribed on his cannon by Louis the Fourteenth—is not to be, with me, the first argument of the Republic! especially in this age of advanced civilization and social international communication, and when reason and justice, not force and arms, should settle, as far as possible, the controversies of nations as well as individuals.

I shall not be in favor of a war with Mexico to enforce her revival of the Garay Tehuantepec grant, twice defunct under the laws of Mexico; once upon the limitation of time for the fulfilment of its conditions; and once upon a decree in Congress for bribery in its inception; and which double defunct grant is now held by some of our millionaire citizens who call upon the American government to bully or whip that feeble power into submission to their demands. That grant is for a monopoly road across the Isthmus, and is a route upon foreign territory. Justice, as well as charity, should begin at home; and the good book says, that man is worse than a heathen, who does not provide for his own household. We have territory of our own for making a road to the Pacific ocean, and have been four years begging the means of making it—for making even a common wagon and horse road; but all to no purpose. Not even a bridle path marked out yet from the frontiers of Missouri to the State of California, or the territory of Oregon; nor any road to New Mexico, except the one which I got marked out twenty-five years ago. I should not be in favor of bullying or whipping Mexico into the establishment of the foreign monopoly Tehuantepec route at all, even if the grant was yet alive; and much less when we can get nothing for a free national road, for our own citizens, upon our own territory.

I am against rushing into a war with great Britain, to settle with cannon the meaning of some words in the fishing convention of 1818. The settlement of the meaning of that treaty, and of all treaties, is a proper subject for arbitrament—for reference to some disinterested authority, and for submission to the decision of that authority. We want no new conventions; that might be as difficult to understand as the present one; for the diplomatic art is very successful in depositing the seeds of a new contestation in every settlement of an old one. We want the present treaty interpreted; and the interpretation depends upon the meaning of some half a dozen lines of English writing, done by eminent scholars and statesmen, and surely susceptible of explication. Let us get an interpreter, any fair man in the character of an arbitrator, to tell Great Britain and America what the words mean. This is a usual proceeding among nations, even in the case of unadjusted and complicated difficulties; and much more so in the case of disputed construction of existing stipulations. It is the course we followed with Great Britain herself in the case of the slaves deported during the war of 1812. The first article of the treaty of Ghent stipulated for their restitution, or indemnity. The two powers could not agree upon the classes of slaves which the stipulation would cover. Twelve years were spent in verbal disputation; and then the point was referred by mutual consent to the Emperor Alexander, who decided it in favor of the United States. And then a million and a quarter of dollars, withheld to the damage of the owners for twelve years, were paid, and the controversy settled.

The treaty of peace of 1783 with Great Britain contained a similar stipulation in relation to the slaves deported during the war of the revolution; and the same construction. Twenty years were consumed in its negotiation; no arbitration was proposed, or, if proposed, not accepted, and the value of all those slaves was lost to the owners. Arbitration procured under the treaty of Ghent what twenty years of negotiation, beginning under Washington, could not obtain under the treaty of 1783; and gain or lose, arbitration is the right way to settle the meaning of the words in relation to this fishing privilege. We want no new treaty, and, if we did, would admit the defect of the present one; and the new one might give rise to the same double interpretation. War does not construe treaties, but abrogates them; and by war we should lose the present stipulation, and possibly not get an-

other. I am for proposing arbitration; and in the mean time, do nothing to alarm the country, or bring on hostilities.

I am against alarming the country with a talk of war, when there is to be no war—at least none constitutionally made. No Ministry in Great Britain, and no Congress in the United States, can make war out of this question. Thirty-two millions of people on one side, and twenty-four on the other, speaking the same language, professing the same religion, dividing blood, engaged in active commercial and social communcation, with no rivalry, except in the usefual arts, and which Thirty-two and Twenty-four, the cause of liberal government throughout the world requires to stand together; no such fifty-six millions of people can be set to fighting, (with their own consent,) to settle the meaning of some words in a fishing treaty! and they would smash, each part for itself, any Ministry or Congress who should set them at it without their consent. The Derby Ministry, which has given practical consequence to this verbal dispute, is already disposed of; the late elections have already disposed of it—thereby proving that it was not a “stable” ministry, taking the word in whatever sense it may bear. There will be no war—none constitutionally made; and it is wrong to alarm the country with the fear of such a calamity. Such alarms do mischief to the business of the country—to commerce and stocks, and enterprise of all kinds. Property is timid; and it is a cruel sporting with the interests of individuals to raise this alarm; not the less so because the danger with some is magnified, to magnify the glory of averting it! with others the war talk is nothing but fanfaronade, to purchase cheap popularity; with others, again, mere gab without thought.

I am against sending ships of war to the scene of dispute. It is the way to bring on hostilities, and not prevent them; and to bring them on by an Executive order, instead of a law of Congress. Put two men face to face, with a quarrel in their bosoms, and arms in their hands; and how long will it be before they will use those arms; before accident or design brings on conflict? It is the same, on a larger scale, with fleets and armies. Confront them—tell them to watch each other—tell them to take care of the national honor and interest—and they will do it! do it in the only way known to arms! the favorite way with all to whom war is a profession! And when blood once flows, there is an end to any argument but that of the cannon, until blood is avenged. “*American blood has been shed on an American ship,*” will be just as potent over the passions as the same words were in relation to American soil, and brought about in the same way. The march of the American troops from Corpus Christi to the Rio Grande made that shedding of “American blood on American soil,” which put an end to all peaceful negotiations, fired all passions, and extorted from Congress the declaration of war against Mexico. A similar shedding of “American blood on an American ship,” on the coast of Labrador, or in the Bay of Fundy, may bring on a war with Great Britain, the result of an accident, or passion, or misconstruction of orders; but not the less calamitous to the country for such a fortuitous beginning.

I therefore look upon this movement of ships to the disputed fishing grounds as unwise and dangerous—more apt to bring on a war than to prevent it—and to bring it on suddenly and unconstitutionally; and in the midst of the active commercial and social relations of the two countries. Arbitration is the remedy; and it will be the successful one, for no ministry in Great Britain, or administration in the United States, could stand an hour against the indignation of fifty-six millions of people, which ministry or administration should refuse to accede to that peaceful mode of settling the meaning of a few words in a treaty. Let either make it; and the other will be bound to accept it, or give way to those who will.